



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 143  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/749,752

12/30/2003

Matthew Mattina

42P17893

9070

8791

7590

03/12/2007

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN  
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD  
SEVENTH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

WALTER, CRAIG E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2188

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

03/12/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/749,752	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MATTINA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Craig E. Walter	<b>Art Unit</b> 2188	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8 January 2007 has been entered.

### ***Status of Claims***

2. Claims 1, 3-20 are pending in the Application.

Claim 1 has been amended.

Claim 2 has been cancelled.

Claims 14-20 are new.

Claims 1 and 3-20 are rejected.

### ***Response to Amendment***

3. Applicant's amendments and arguments filed on 8 January 2007 in response to the office action mailed on 7 September 2006 has been fully considered, but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

4. Claims 18-20 are objected to because of the following informalities:

As for claim 18, the phrase "the processor die" as recited in line 6 of the claim should be changed to "the processor chip" into to properly establish antecedent basis for the phrase.

Claims 19-20 are objected to for inheriting the deficiency of claim 18.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 3-6, 10,14, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bordaz et al. (US Patent 6,195,728 B1), and in further view of Jennings (US Patent 6,134,631).

As for claims 1, 14 and 18, Bordaz teaches a system (as in claims 1 and 18, and apparatus in claim 14) for maintaining cache coherency in a CMP comprising:

one or more processor cores (Fig. 1, elements 11-14, 31-34, 51-54 and 71-74 depict a plurality of processor cores), wherein the one or more processor cores each include a private cache (each processor contains its own private cache as depicted in Fig. 1 (element 11 is the private cache for processor 1 for example));

a shared cache (Fig. 1, memory (element 5) is shared among at least two processors));

and a ring to connect the one or more processors and the shared cache (Fig. 1, element 16 – the ring is used for communication between each module (elements 10, 20, etc) which each contain a plurality of processors;

Despite these teachings, Bordaz fails to specifically teach these particular elements as being stored on an integrated circuit (i.e. single processor chip). More specifically, Bordaz teaches four discrete modules (Fig. 1, elements 10, 20, 40 and 60) which each comprises multiple processors (each with a unique private cache), and a shared cache.

Jennings teaches a non-volatile memory with embedded programmable controller in which his plurality of modules may all implemented on a single integrated chip (storage system 50 (Fig. 1) may be a multi-chip module, or a single integrated circuit – col. 3, lines 52-58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Bordaz to implement his discrete modules on a single integrated circuit as taught by Jennings. By doing so, Bordaz could exploit the well-known benefits of single chip integration, which includes lower manufacturing costs, and increased communication speed between the discrete elements implement on the one chip.

It is worthy to note that though Bordaz teaches an “on-module” cache rather than an on-chip cache as recited by Applicant, this would have been obvious over Bordaz as once all four modules are implemented on a single chip as discussed above in the

Art Unit: 2188

combined teachings of Bordaz and Jennings. More specifically the shared caches within each module would be stored on that very single chip when Bordaz and Jennings are combined; hence they are “on-chip” cache. It is additionally worthy to note that the shared cache within each module acts as a system memory for storing element held by the shared memory.

As for claim 3, Bordaz teaches the system of claim 1 wherein shared cache includes one or more cache banks (inherently all cache memory must be arranged in a configuration of at least one bank. Additionally, Bordaz indicates that each shared cache contains a remote access cache (RC – element 15), which is a separate memory bank within the shared cache (element 5)).

As for claim 4, Bordaz teaches wherein the one or more cache banks is responsible for a subset of a physical address space of the system (col. 4, lines 28-46 – the RC (element 15) makes up a portion of the total physical memory of memory element 5).

As for claims 5 and 6, Bordaz teaches the system of claim 1 wherein the one or more processor cores are write-thru, which write data through to the shared cache (col. 7, lines 56-65 – Bordaz discusses a write through cache mechanism which writes to reserved zones in the shared cache (i.e. element 25)).

As for claim 10, Bordaz teaches the system of claim 1 wherein the one or more processor cores accesses data from the shared cache (col. 4, lines 47-53 – each processor accesses data blocks in the shared memories).

Art Unit: 2188

As for claims 16 and 19, the shared memory is a shared cache including a plurality of blocks, mad wherein the shared cache is capable of holding each of the plurality of blocks in a cache coherency state (tags are stored and associated with blocks of the cache to indicate which blocks are held exclusively (i.e. to maintain coherency) by a processor - col. 5, lines 21-51).

As for claim 17 and 20, wherein the cache coherency state for each of the plurality of blocks is selected from a group consisting of (1) a not present state, (2) a present and owned by a core of the plurality of cores state, (3) a present, not owned, and custodian is a core of the plurality of core states, and (4) a present, not owned, and no custodian state (the tags include information to indicate if the data is valid and if it is held exclusively by a particular processor – col. 5, lines 21-51).

6. Claims 7-9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Bordaz (US Patent 6,195,728 B1) and Jennings (US Patent 6,134,631) as applied to claim 1 above, and in further view of Fletcher (US Patent 4,445,174).

As for claims 7-9, though Bordaz teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the one or more processor cores include a buffer, he fails to teach the buffer as functioning merge buffer capable of purging stored data to a shared cache.

Fletcher however teaches a multiprocessor system including a shared cache which a processor's private cache (Fig. 1, element 8) continuously stores data (permitting the merging of data (i.e. line by line) into the private memory from the main memory until an eviction is requested) –col. 1, line 62-68, and then moves the lines

Art Unit: 2188

directly from a private cache to the shared cache, while circumventing the system's main memory (col. 2, lines 56-64).

As for claim 11, Fletcher further discloses the private cache, which is used to merge data from the memory line by line, as coalescing multiple lines to a same block of the shared cache – col. 3, line 17-25 – copies of the same shared memory block may exist simultaneously in each private cache. In other words, data stored in a processor's private cache can exist as one memory block of the shared memory.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the combined teachings of Bordaz and Jennings to further include Fletcher's multiprocessor system including a shared cache to his own system. By doing so, would realize improved system performance by having a means of automatically detecting lines of information moved to the shared cache, hence eliminating "pingponging" of lines between requesting processors as taught by Fletcher in col. 2, lines 49-65.

7. Claims 12, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Bordaz (US Patent 6,195,728 B1) and Jennings (US Patent 6,134,631) as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and in further view of Koenen (US PG Publication 2004/0019891 A1).

As for claims 12,13 and 15, though Bordaz teaches connecting his each processor module via a ring configuration as claimed by Applicant in claim 1, he fails to specifically teach the ring configuration as recited by Applicant in claims 12-13 of the pending Application.



Koenen however teaches an apparatus for optimizing performance in a multi-processing system, which includes connecting a plurality of module nodes via a synchronous, unbuffered, bi-directional ring with a fixed deterministic latency as recited by Applicant in claim 12-13. Referring to Fig. 1, a plurality of processing nodes (elements 12, 14 and 16) are connected for bi-directional communication (elements 12J, 14J and 16J) with the interconnect fabric (element 18). Note Koenen describes the fabric as including a ring structure in paragraph 0019, lines 9-12. The ring functions without the aid of a buffering system (i.e. unbuffered), and supports synchronous connections with a minimum static latency around the ring (paragraph 0026, lines 7-12 – the minimum latency is static). Furthermore, paragraph 0023 (and subsequently Table 1), describe preset latencies between each node depending on the number of nodes included in the system. With this table, the overall latency of the entire ring interconnect is known (likewise, fixed), which allows the system to synchronize communication between nodes.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, for the combined teachings of Bordaz and Jennings to implement Koenen's apparatus for optimizing performance in a multi-processing system. By doing so, they would benefit by using a superior interconnection fabric (as shown by Koenen in Fig. 1, element 18) for his processing modules, which in turn could help Bordaz's NUMA machine by reducing access latency and increase system performance as taught by Koenen in paragraph 0011, lines 1-15.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.


***Conclusion***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Craig E. Walter whose telephone number is (571) 272-8154. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30a - 5:00p M-F.

10. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hyung S. Sough can be reached on (571) 272-6799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2188

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Craig E Walter  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2188

CEW



HYUNG SONGH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

3-7-07